



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 27, 2016

Mr. William C. Ferebee
City Attorney
City of Shenandoah
29955 Interstate 45 North
Shenandoah, Texas 77381

OR2016-09491

Dear Mr. Ferebee:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 607436.

The City of Shenandoah (the "city") received four requests for information pertaining to three named city police officers.¹ You state the city will release some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.1175 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) renders federal tax return information confidential. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open

¹We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as “a taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]” *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term “return information” expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer’s liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff’d in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Thus, the submitted W-4 forms, which we have marked, constitute tax return information that is confidential under section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Id. § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Upon review, we find the information

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

we have marked constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician and information obtained from a patient's medical records. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 611.002 provides, in pertinent part:

(a) Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b). Section 611.001 defines a "professional" as (1) a person authorized to practice medicine, (2) a person licensed or certified by the state to diagnose, evaluate or treat mental or emotional conditions or disorders, or (3) a person the patient reasonably believes is authorized, licensed, or certified. *See id.* § 611.001(2). Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining information, which we have marked, consists of a mental health record that is subject to chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the marked mental health record under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, "[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act]." Gov't Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) ("biometric identifier" means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). There is no indication the requestor has a right of access to the fingerprint under section 560.002. *See id.* § 560.002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual's biometric identifier to another person unless the individual consents to disclosure). Accordingly, the city must withhold the fingerprints we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.⁵

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See id.* § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter E-1, or subchapter F of the Government Code. *See Gov’t Code* § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter E-1 or subchapter F of the Government Code. We note section 411.083 does not apply to active warrant information or other information relating to one’s current involvement with the criminal justice system. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person’s current involvement in the criminal justice system). Further, CHRI does not include driving record information. *See id.* § 411.082(2)(B). Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining information, which we have marked, consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.⁶

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” *Id.* § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The Texas Supreme Court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Having reviewed the information at issue, we have marked information that must be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.⁷ However, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a), and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). This office has found financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy. *See* ORD 600 (designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care). However, we note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

⁷As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We note section 552.117(a)(1) is not applicable to a former spouse and does not protect the fact that a governmental employee has been divorced. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.⁸ However, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117(a)(2), and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. *See id.* § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to “peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]” *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). We note section 552.1175(b) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of an individual who falls within the scope of section 552.1175(a), provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 662 at 6 (1994). Some of the remaining information relates to individuals who were licensed as peace officers of other law enforcement agencies at the time the information at issue was created. However, we are unable to determine from the information provided which, if any, of the individuals at issue are currently licensed peace officers. Thus, we must rule conditionally. Accordingly, to the extent the information at issue, which we have marked, relates to individuals who are currently licensed as peace officers and who elect to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, if the individuals whose information is at issue are not currently licensed as peace officers or do not elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the marked information may not be withheld under section 552.1175. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.1175, and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

⁸As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.⁹ Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

We note some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with (1) section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, (2) the MPA, (3) section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code, (4) section 560.003 of the Government Code, and (5) section 411.083 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, (2) section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, and (3) section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are licensed peace officers and elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code; however the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code and the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

⁹The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

The city must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/bw

Ref: ID# 607436

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)